

Agenda item 4.3

Paragraph 20 of the annotated agenda

Stakeholder consultation processes

CDM EB 64

Bonn, Germany, 24 – 26 October, 2011



- Background
- Summary of inputs received
- Possible ways forward
- Executive Board discussion

- Stakeholder complaints
 - a) System not user-friendly
 - b) Inputs not being accounted for
- DOE Forum request:
 - a) Provide clarity on how to deal with vexatious and/or libelous comments
- The Board considered a proposal and background paper prepared by a member
- The Board considered a further analysis by the secretariat and agreed to launch a call for inputs

- Call open: 18 July – 15 August
- Total response: 19
- Overview summary
 - a) 6 similar inputs received from international environmental NGO's, plus a similar input from Wuppertal Institute
 - b) 5 similar inputs from the Gujarat Forum on CDM and individuals from Gujarat
 - c) Unique inputs received from DOE Forum, Project Developer Forum, Transparency International, and three individuals from China

Main points raised:

- Local stakeholder consultation process
 - a) Consultations need not be CDM specific and can be done together with other regulatory requirements (e.g. EIA)
 - b) Compliance national legislative requirements should take precedence over compliance with stakeholder concerns
 - c) Clearer and more defined rules should be provided for local consultation, such as requirements to
 - Hold a meeting, which is well advertised including specific invitations to relevant groups
 - Make non-technical summaries of the project available
 - Conduct consultation during the design phase
 - Make summaries of the consultation available and hold follow up meetings
 - Make all information available in the local language



Main points raised:

- Global stakeholder consultation process
 - a) Extend the length of time for comments
 - b) Introduce requirements regarding the amount of supporting documentation made available
 - c) Require stakeholders to register prior to submitting comments
 - d) Provide clarity to DOEs regarding how to address comments received
 - e) Provide clarity to stakeholders regarding the scope of comments, i.e. comments must be project specific and substantiated

Other suggestions:

- Various enhancements to the transparency of the validation process have been recommended
- A grievance mechanism for stakeholders

- The comments make clear that all parties involved (local and global stakeholders, project developers and DOEs) are dissatisfied with the current processes
- It is worth noting however that the comments do not merely present alternative positions and propositions on the same topic
- Many constructive suggestions for improvements of the system which could be mutually beneficial and agreeable have been provided
- The only suggestion requiring a CMP decision would be an extension of the period of time for conducting global stakeholder consultation

- Further analyse the inputs received
- Recommend improvements for possible incorporation into the PS, VVS and PCP

For EB discussion:

- Initial views on the merit of the inputs received
- Decision on the next steps